

Application No.: 10/623,958
Date of Response: 09/02/2004
Reply to Action of: 08/20/2004

REMARKS

The applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's restriction requirement of August 20, 2004, and respectfully requests reconsideration thereof. The applicant notes that the elected species appears in both sets of generic claims. It
5 is unclear how the Examiner determined that two separate and distinct inventions are being claimed, as no reasoning was presented. The applicant now makes a good faith effort to reply to the Examiner's Office action, despite his disagreement with the restriction.

The applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is a generic claim, with
10 claims 2-10 and 19 dependent thereupon being species of the genus defined in claim 1. Likewise, claim 11 is a generic claim, with claims 12-18 and 20 dependent thereupon being species of the genus defined in claim 11.

MPEP § 806.04(d), Definition of a Generic Claim, reads as follows:

In general, a generic claim should include no material